



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

It is too early yet to try to determine what effect the new treaty will have in the direction of disarmament. Its influence is sure to be powerful in bringing about that set of conditions which will ultimately render disarmament necessary and easy. It will prevent war scares between the two nations. It will cement them in closer friendship and esteem. It will make Anglo-American diplomacy much easier. It will make the attitude of both Great Britain and the United States towards other nations more pacific and disinterested. Their better spirit toward each other will follow them in all their relations to other peoples. All talk of the treaty being an Anglo-American alliance against the rest of the world is pure nonsense. It has come from principles and been demanded by a public sentiment exactly the opposite of those which create offensive and defensive alliances. European dissatisfaction with the treaty, if there is any, as rumored, will vanish as soon as its real meaning is understood. It ought, therefore, to be provocative of a better feeling between European peoples. It will tend to steady the financial conditions of the world and thus to add to the general prosperity and happiness. Its effect in all these directions in preparing the way for disarmament must be very great.

As to the provisions of the treaty, they do not seem to us all that could have been desired. Five years is a very short term for so important an agreement to run. The two countries have had an arbitration only about once in eight or nine years, on the average, so that the specified period may pass without any opportunity to test the practical value of the machinery provided. The treaty tribunal provides for temporary tribunals only, instead of for a permanent one whose judicial life should be continuous. It also provides for different kinds of tribunals for different classes of cases. It would have been much simpler and just as efficient to have provided for a single tribunal of "jurists of repute" or of judges of the national courts, before which all sorts of cases should have been carried. It seems also possible, remotely so at least, under the limitations put upon the tribunal of supreme court judges for an arbitration finally to fail.

But none of these objections are as serious as they seem at first sight to be. The treaty is the result of a compromise over serious differences of opinion as to how the machinery of arbitration was to be constituted. Such machinery must, in the nature of the case, at first be more or less tentative. The demand for a permanent arbitral arrangement between the two countries is so great and growing that the treaty is sure to be renewed at the end of the five years, when modifications will be in order. In favor of the treaty as now drawn, it may be said that by its provisions the larger number of important cases likely to arise will receive final settlement by the tribunals. It also provides that all other disagreements, no matter

how serious, shall go to arbitration, and try that method of settlement first. It is practically certain that any case which the two governments shall attempt to settle in this way, they will settle by arbitration, without recourse even to the mediation of a friendly power as provided in the treaty; for it will always remain in their power to create a special tribunal for any case on which the general tribunal may have disagreed, just as they have created a special commission to finish what the Paris tribunal failed to accomplish. The bare existence of the treaty will also make it much easier for diplomacy to adjust any disagreements which may arise. We have always believed that the chief value of a permanent arbitral system would be in the entire prevention of disputes or their speedy and quiet settlement by diplomatic agencies. On the whole, therefore, the theoretical objections which may properly be brought against the machinery set up by this treaty do not seem to us to have much practical weight, and ought not to prevent its hearty ratification by the Senate, even without amendments, if the British government should not be willing to make further concessions.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE TREATY.

The message which President Cleveland sent to the Senate when he transmitted to that body the treaty of arbitration, signed on the 11 ult., may be the last which he will ever communicate to Congress. But it is certainly, though a short document, in many respects the most important communication which he has ever sent to the Capitol. Of all his messages it will remain, as long as he lives, the one with which he will feel peculiarly honored to have had his name connected.

The President's attitude toward the movement for permanent arbitral relations between this country and others has been distinctly favorable from the beginning. When his attention was first specially directed to it some ten years ago during his first administration, he expressed himself with some caution as to the feasibility of a general and permanent application of the principle of arbitration to international disputes, while distinctly recognizing its desirability and utility so far as practicable. As time has gone on his commitment of himself has become more and more complete and emphatic, until at the present time he is one of its warmest and foremost supporters. The part which he has had in bringing to successful completion the difficult and lengthy negotiation whose result is the treaty now signed, will always be to his great honor. The conspicuous part which Mr. Olney has had in the negotiation does not lessen in the least the merit of the President, without whose direction, support and sympathy nothing could have been done. The language of this short message is warm and hopeful beyond what is usual in such documents. The President is not blind to the imperfections of the treaty as it has been formu-

lated, but believes it "a long step in the right direction." We are glad to quote his words in full, and to express at the same time our high and sincere appreciation of the noble spirit which breathes in them:

THE MESSAGE.

To the Senate: I transmit herewith a treaty for the arbitration of all matters in difference between the United States and Great Britain.

The provisions of the treaty are the result of long and patient deliberation, and represent concessions made by each party, for the sake of agreement upon the general scheme.

Though the result reached may not meet the views of the advocates of immediate, unlimited and irrevocable arbitration of all international controversies, it is, nevertheless, confidently believed that the treaty cannot fail to be everywhere recognized as taking a long step in the right direction, and as embodying a practical, working plan by which disputes between the two countries will reach a peaceful adjustment as matter of course and ordinary routine. In the initiation of such an important movement, it must be expected that some of its features will assume a tentative character looking to a further advance; and yet, it is apparent that the treaty which has been formulated not only makes war between the parties to it a remote possibility, but precludes those fears and rumors of war which of themselves too often assume the proportions of a national disaster.

It is eminently fitting, as well as fortunate, that the attempt to accomplish results so beneficial should be initiated by kindred peoples, speaking the same tongue and joined together by all the ties of common traditions, common institutions and common aspirations. The experiment of substituting civilized methods for brute force as the means of settling international questions of right will thus be tried under the happiest auspices. Its success ought not to be doubtful, and the fact that its ultimate ensuing benefits are not likely to be limited to the two countries immediately concerned should cause it to be promoted all the more eagerly. The example set and the lesson furnished by the successful operation of this treaty are sure to be felt and taken to heart sooner or later by other nations, and will thus mark the beginning of a new epoch in civilization.

Profoundly impressed as I am, therefore, by the promise of transcendent good which this treaty affords, I do not hesitate to accompany its transmission with an expression of my earnest hope that it may commend itself to the favorable consideration of the Senate.

RICHARD OLNEY AND SIR JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

Richard Olney and Sir Julian Pauncefote, whose pictures we give on the front page of this paper, are hereafter to rank among the most fortunate of diplomatists. It is not once in a century that two men get the opportunity of having as conspicuous a part in a transaction really great and fraught with such immeasurable blessings to future generations as these two men have had in the drafting and signing of the general arbitration treaty between Great Britain and the United States.

And why should we not call them great as well as fortunate? Great men are simply men who do intelli-

gently and conscientiously great, beneficial deeds, when there is occasion for them. These two men will be ranked among the great, not merely because they have had an exceptional opportunity to do something important, nor again because their names are spoken of with great honor everywhere, but because they possessed both the spirit and the wisdom to do with exceptional success, a great duty which had providentially fallen to their lot.

It is true, the ground had been well prepared for what they have done, by many years of difficult, and often thankless toil on the part of the friends of peace both in public and private life. Much of this work is now forgotten or known only to a few. But this necessary work of the past does not lessen in any sense, the merit of the present. When Ambassador Pauncefote and Secretary Olney, under instructions from their respective governments, began this negotiation in May last, the difficulties in the way of its successful accomplishment were many and perplexing, such as yield only to the most intelligent, patient and unrelenting treatment. Even after the publication of the correspondence in July last, many, perhaps a large majority, on both sides of the sea, felt that the undertaking was futile and must in the end fail. Not a few declared that it ought to fail. Even the most confident friends of peace had their doubts whether the moment of success had come.

It is due to the earnest, conscientious and wise efforts of these two statesmen that the moment of success did come so soon. In weaker and less skillful hands the whole undertaking would, for the time being, have fallen through, notwithstanding the pressure of public opinion which spurred them on. Public opinion was not sufficiently one way to make progress easy. They did much themselves to develop public opinion and render it confident and courageous. Both the British Ambassador and the American Secretary seem to have felt that a great hour was upon them, and that the interests not only of the present but of future times were dependent upon their faithfulness. Their course in the matter has been the course of thoroughly honest, conscientious and capable men, in whom the best spirit of the time has found true interpreters.

It would be invidious to start a comparison between them and say, or try to say which is the more meritorious. There is no ground, so far as we can see, for such a comparison. Sir Julian Pauncefote has conducted the negotiation on the British side with admirable skill, with warm devotion to the interests of his country not only, but also to the larger interests of all English-speaking people and of civilization in general. There has been no arbitrariness or rigidity in his method; quite the contrary. It has been very fortunate for the English Prime Minister that he has had at Washington such a representative as the present Ambassador, who had "set his heart on having